P.7. 205-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

1891-92

Previous references.

File No.

192 .

Serial Nos.

(L.R)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Petition of Lakshmana VeeraRaghava Chetty, Cloth merchant, Sreerangapatnam, against the fine imposed on him for the alleged smuggling ten tins of Ghee —.

The Deputy Commissioner Mysore District.

No. 6701 / P.7.205-92 dt. 15/17.11.1892. —

Directing the Deputy Comm? to strike off the petition from the file as the whereabouts of the petitioner are not known —.

WD 2238—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Constituted

Petition No. 373 dated
11 June/19: from
Lachchanna Veerara-
ganalu Chetty, Cloth
Merchant, Seringapa-
tam, Mysore District.

Docket No. 508 dated
13 Sept/19: from the
Dy: Com? Mysore Dt?
submitting the record
of enquiry and fine
imposed upon the
Petr. for the alleged
smuggling of 10 Yds
of Shee-

The Principal
Collector of Seringapatam
reported

24 Nov/20

reported to the vice
President that ac-
cording to the order
of the latter the
Paraguayan Consular
demanded Varaguas to Asuncion
. such to pay up
the taxes duty on
the iron of the
brought in by him
by Railway on the
7 Sept/90; that
at first Varaguas
with thirty armed
horsemen received the

She

ghee but after
much equivocation
he promised to pay
the duty as soon
as his partner Ven-
-katramanchetty
returned from a
village and that
he however refused
to pay it when the
Manager went up
to him again to
demand the payment

and

and the Municipal
Overseer therefore
submitted for the
Civil President's order
the depositions given 14 Jun/90.
by Veerarupavalletty
before the Servisputum
Dy: Amildar whereon
Veerarupavalletty
stated that his name
was Lachmon Veera
-(raghava)Chetty and
not Veerarupavalletty;
that he did not deal
in

× Omitted.
The letters ඒ - ඩ
have been omitted
to be written in this
statement.
But in his subsequent
statement of 10.3.91 before
the Dy Ams. His Appt states
that his name is "Lakshmana
Vira raghava Pillai".

in shee and received
no shee; and that
he was only a Clot
Merchant — "After some conversa
" The Dy:
Amildar of Seringa-
patam reported t
the Asst: Dr Agent,
French Rocks, that
the Station Master
of Seringapatam
stated in his deposition
that to this of shee
which were consigned
from

22
23 March/91

from Pennapatam

was delivered to

Veerarayanadu Chetty;

that the said Veera

rajavadu Chetty

had falsely stated

that he did not

receive the Chee on the

7 Sept 1790; that it

was evident from the

(1)..

enquiry held that

he had changed

the Chee for the

purpose of evading

the payment of

Inbundled

(1) Meine for Kanakka
Mudali,
2 Seringapatam Station
master Narsim maiya
3. Ry Polei Constable
Mahomed Buden
4. Ry Servant Ahmed
Ally

Examined for the
Respt. prove the fact
of V. R. Chetty having taken
away the Chee.

and.

1 V. R. Chetty
2 Lingaker
3 Boarketi
4 Brenna

for V. R. Chetty
say that he (V. R. Ch.)
does not know in
what act
2 D. L. (Chenna Reddi?)
In defence
whose statement
has been given below-
testifies to the facts
in this hearing
received but taken
down by a person
other than V. R. Chetty

28 March 19-

the Petrol duty, and
that in his conduct
appeared very suspicious
inside the amount
of the duty should
be collected from
him. On this he
had no other course
but to issue the following order-

"On Statement of
the Railway Officials
I have no doubt as to
the identity of Veeru
Rangaradu Chetty-

The accompanying
records clearly
prove that he did
smuggle into the
Municipality 10
tins of Ghee on the
7 Sept 1920. The fine
recommended by
the Dy. ~~Co~~ Assistant
is by no means heavy.
It will accordingly
be recovered from
Veerarayudu's Salary.

Against

against the above
order Petr. appeal.
to this Office on the
following grounds.
1- That the Senio.
-Superintendent: Amd.
has failed to examine
the individual who
sent* the Shee and
it has not been
ascertained where
the Shee was taken
to -

2-

* Submitted.

" In this case
sender & Consignee
is the same person.
V. Rajendra Chetty
himself booked
the Cases" — Goods
Way Bill no. 9
ex Kennakatna
to Serugapatam,
5 Cases Shee -."
Vide Kennakatna
Station Master's reply to

10

By Brisbane - Mano
No: 1020 9 27th Sep 90

2. That there are discrepancies between the letters first written by the Station Master and his deposition. Sir, By: Counsel has not taken this into his consideration and his report has been believed by the Sub. Dn Officer. And the Cases sent to the Pets.

(2) The statement given by the station master serving Kateen is to the following effect -

On the 7th September 90 5 Cases of Ghee were received from Hemchatra Mukerjee of Viraphara (Kelly). As it was Sunday there was not much work & I was gone in the town to see the Tamash there. Viraphara Sheikh now present before Court & whose name I do not know Came to me & wanted the Ghee urgently. I said it could not be given as it was Sunday. Then he (V. R. Chelly) begged me hard for it. I said I would give it after the Train left. I gave train left. I gave over the Cases at about 7½ (P.M.). I was not aware of the article being subject to Octroi. V. R. Chelly now present signed (the book?) & took the Ghee. Parcels

addressed to V. Rachetty are received. I am not aware any parcel has been received by the address of Lakshmana Vira Raghava Chetty

D/ 16.2.91.

Letter marked A from the station master Peringipatam to the Tahsildar. - D/ 13.9.90

Sirs

I have not received any consignment of Shee by the address of Kavur Venkat Rama Chetty on the 7th inst. but a Consignment of (Bengal mounds) 5-20 sacks shee to one V. Raghava Chetty was received & delivered on that date. I do not know whether he has taken it to Peringipatam or any where else.

Letter B D/ 22.9.90 from the same

etc. by the Railway and the books have not been examined.

3. That P.W. is an outsider trading in cloth, and through other & local merchants and money lenders of Vinnamala have made out this case against him.

4. That P.W. witness were discredited by the Dy. Collector and the statement

Statement of one of there, a Railway person to the effect that it was not Petr. but some other outsider that imported the article was mis-interpreted by the Dy: Conservator.

5- That the Sub Dn. Magistrate order is opposed to law and the weight of evidence in the matter

(Contd) -

"Informs that the Consignment of Shee Lo. & Sri Raghavachetty was booked under Invoice No: 9 of 6.9.90 from Kanuparthy Station."

Advocate for Petr.
25 Oct/91

The appellant contends further that from the statement of the manager himself who first made the complaint, it is evident that the complaint is false.

The manager Kamaya Murudai mentioned a report dated 8th September 1890 to the Sengapatam Taluk Kachari & the effect that he gave a cheque to Karur Venkata Ramaswami & his father for one big parcel of cloths for payment of duty at the Taluk Kachari, that they on their way broke open the parcel, took out some of the cloths, made matching cloths with 2 small bundles, presented them at the Kachari & that I saw the duty, that after he took a note of the articles received

by the 7 o'clock train, there ~~were~~ two persons waited upon the station master and managed to smuggle at 8 P.M. 5 cases (= 10 tins) of ghee, and that the matter should be enquired into

The manager when examined before the Dy Amildar on 16th Feb 1891 states -

I was manager when I gave the (above) report now shown me. It was 8 o'clock that night. Station master Narsimhaiya gave it (ghee) although it was Sunday; I was alone & they were 4 men. I could not therefore catch them. The Police being near the Tank I came there, but there was no body at the Kachery. I gave a report on the following morning. They took away the ghee in different directions I was afraid of being beaten I could not therefore follow them."

The appellant states that the statement of the witness - a Dy servant has been mis-understood

The statement of the 5th
witness for the defence is
to the effect.

I was a Railway servt.
from Sept. to Dec. 9.
Shee was received
on the 7th Sept 9.
two or 3 cases were
received. Via Paga-
vachatty received no
shee that day. He
used to get clothes once
in 8 or 10 days. Afte
the 7 o'clock train some
somebody came &
asked for the shee. The
station master caused
it to be given by a porter.
There was a cart. drawn
by a single bullock.
The bullock man said
he had come to take
shee. It is not usual
to give goods at night.

note. How the shee
was disposed of does
not appear to have
been ascertained

16

The Pl. Pass & the Book & Concerned shewing the receipt & delivery of the goods have not been produced.

VL
6/12/92

Posted for Hrg on 21st inst 92

VL
11/4/92

11/4/92

Adjourned to 11th August 92

1/7/92

VL

Adjourned to 5.8.
Nov 92
VL
6/8/92

17

(11)

M. No. 786 of 1891-92

M/s
Karur
Lakshmana Virraghavadutty
of Arrangalla

P. complains that ~~an action~~ ~~has been~~ ~~instituted~~ ~~against him on~~ ~~certain quantity of~~ ~~ghee~~ a fine was ordered to be collected from him on ~~account of his having~~ a charge of his having exceeded ~~the~~ payment of octroi duty on a certain quantity of ghee alleged to have been imported by him, but that he never actually imported the ghee.—

A notice was issued calling upon the P. to appear & prove his statement; but the notice was returned unserved as he is therefrom out of Karur.—

P. Pakkam will therefore be struck off the file.—

4.1.1892

OFFICE OF TH
21 JUL. 91
DEWAN OF MYS

2

• ತಿರುಂಡಲ ಧಾನಾಂಶ ಸೆಗೆ —

ದಲಾಂದ ಯಾವ್ಯಾಂದ ತಂ ಯಾಂ ಸಂಪಾದಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶ ಸ್ಥಾನ ಂಶಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಂ ಂಶ ಸ್ಥಿ

2 ಸ್ಥಿರಿ ಸಾಂಪಾದಿಸ್ಥಿರ ಸಾಂದರ್ಭಲ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ ಂಶಿಂಶಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ, ಯಾಂ ಂ ಂ

ಯಾಂ ಸಾಂದಿರ ಸಂ ಯಾಂ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಂ ಯಾಂ, ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂ ಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ ಪಿ ಂ

ಸ್ಥಾಂಶಾಂಶ ಸಂ ಯಾಂ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

3 ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

4 ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಂಶಲ್ಲಿ

5

6

7

Received.
No 681.

21

The statements of the Railway
officials leave no doubt as to the
liability of Vira Raghavachetti.
The accompanying records clearly
prove that he did commit the
Municipality to the sum of Rs 10
on 7th September 1891. The fine was com-
menced by the Dy. Collector in
May to mean heavy. It will be re-
covered from Vira Raghavachetti
I beg upon this circumstance
the duty in submitting the final
report in the case by the Dy. Collector
28-3-91. Signed T. Muthusami Pillai
Sub Collector

"True copy"
Muthusamy
Dy. Collector

Copy applied for 2-4-91
" ready. 15-4-91
delivery 20-4-91.

[illegible] 105

[illegible] 4-3-a

[illegible] 4-4-6

[illegible]

4

తారీఖు 4-4-91
తారీఖు 15-4-91
తారీఖు 20-4-91
నంబరు 424
తారీఖు 4-5-91
తారీఖు 4-4-10

No. 110 R.

2.

2.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

91-2

Camp Kolar

The accompanying Petition No. 373, 15

dated 11th June 91 received at the

Dewan's Office from Lakshmana

Siramappa Chetty, Circu-

lar Road, Bangalore

is forwarded, together with its two

enclosures, to the Deputy Commi-

ssioner, Bangalore for submis-

sion of the record of

Enquiry and Proceed-

ings connected with

the petition.

By Order,

Chief Secretary

BANGALORE,

20 July 1891.

91

Rule.

257.

(General Serial No. 3664)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
1891 12 SEP. 91 P. 41

3.

From The Deputy Commissioner Mysore District

To The Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore

Dated 10th September 1891

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 2 files

General No. 508
No.

Petition copy
43
12/8/91

34
A. Konaraseramu Chetty for recd.
14/9/91 Peon sent
Abd 2-10-91

Submitted with a recd.
21/10/91 Abd

Government official Memo No 110 dated 4th August/91 requesting the submission of the Records of Enquiry and correspondence connected with the Petition of Lakshmanna Veera Raghava Chetty Chetty merchant, against the fine imposed upon him for the alleged non-affixing of Tenth Fee.

I have the honor to submit herewith the entire records called for in the above.

The petition received with the above together with its enclosures are

Returned with the recd. duly revised.
(Please see Orders on the Memorandum of the Appeal Petition)
Abd 7.11.92
7/11/92

B.2
19/9/91

20
are also respectfully directed.

D. Farnsworth
Offg. Deputy Commissioner
Supreme District

27

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

4

Appeal No. 786 of 1891-92

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Karur Lakshmana Veeraraghava Chetty of Seringapatam		

Decision. 7-11-92.

Petitioner complains that a fine was ordered to be collected from him on a charge of his having evaded payment of Octroi duty on a certain quantity of ghee said to have been imported by him, but that he never actually imported the ghee.

2. A notice was issued calling upon the Petitioner to appear and prove his statement, but the notice was returned unserved as his whereabouts are not known.

3 The Petition will therefore be dismissed

D 28.

Aff. the file.

By Order

Receipt
No. 6701 dated 15/11 15/11
Ent. 225-92 for Chief Secretary

Copy to the Deputy Commissioner
Dist. with the Vernacular, received with his
No. 5033 of 16th April 91.

By Order

15/11

15/11
for Chief Secretary